

## REMARKS

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 to clarify that “the shop is configured and arranged to permit sewing to be experienced therein.” Applicants respectfully submit that this language is clear for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §112, second paragraph, rejection of independent Claim 1 and associated dependent Claims 2-7.

Claims 1-4, 7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a), as being as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,768,135 to Park et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,024,037 to Yoshida et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the claimed features of the present invention. The invention according to independent Claim 1 is characterized in that, in addition to clothesmaking kits, a sewing machine and a replay device for replaying a sewing method are provided in a clothesmaking kit shop (i.e., a shop that sells clothesmaking kits). These features of Claim 1 make it possible to open a shop in a small area. In addition, these features enable customers to learn sewing while watching the pictures of a sewing method replayed by the replay device. Therefore, the customers can become more interested in clothesmaking.

In contrast, the Park et al. reference shows and describes keeping try-on apparel 10 at the shelves 20 in Figure 1 and in column 4 (lines 49 to 62) and the like of

the Specification of Park et al. The try-on apparel of Park et al. are merely clothing items with different size parameters varied so that the proper size of the customer can be determined, which proper size is then to make a custom piece of clothing at a factory. Such try-on apparel differs from the claimed “clothesmaking kit,” which is a kit that includes items for allowing the customer to make clothing (such as the fabric required, a pattern, other instructions, etc.).

The Yoshida et al. reference shows and describes providing a sewing machine 1 for the table 3, and discloses storing a program for processing the composition of a sewing program in a recording medium such as a CD ROM or an IC card in Figure 1, and in column 9 (lines 22-31) and the like. Although the Yoshida et al. reference describes a sewing machine and a recording medium for storing a program, the program described in Yoshida et al. is a program for automatically controlling sewing, such as the feeding of fabric.

In the present invention, in contrast, the replay device is provided in order to show customers a sewing method, and therefore the customers can learn and experience sewing with a sewing machine in the shop (page 3, lines 1-3, page 8, lines 1-7 and the like of the Specification). In Applicants’ Specification, in addition, the sewing method recorded in the medium is said to be essentially the same as the descriptions in those manuals on a sewing procedure that are included in the sewing kit (page 7, lines 3-9 of the Specification).

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of independent Claim 1 and associated

dependent Claims 2-4 and 7. Applicants also traverse this rejection of independent Claim 9 for the reasons set forth above.


Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a), as being as being unpatentable over Park et al. in view of Yoshida et al., and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,771,826 to Hirata et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 5 and 6 both depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1, and therefore include all of the features of Claim 1, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this §103 rejection be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 1, and also because the Hirata et al. reference does not remedy the deficiencies noted above.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By   
James K. Folker  
Registration No. 37,538

August 27, 2008  
Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978  
P:\docs\150\98346\DC6077.DOC